EXHIBIT 5

1	STATE OF MICHIGAN			
2	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF MACOMB			
3	UKRAINIAN FUTURE CREDIT UNION,			
4	a state chartered credit union,			
5	Plaintiff, Case No. 2015-0524-CZ			
6	vs.			
7	ADRII B. GARAK, et al,			
8	Defendants.			
9				
10	PROCEEDINGS			
11	BEFORE THE HONORABLE DIANE M. DRUZINSKI, CIRCUIT JUDGE			
12	Mount Clemens, Michigan - Monday, October 31, 2016			
13	A D D E A D A N C E C .			
14	APPEARANCES:			
15	For the Plaintiff: JAMES W. BIGELOW (P42331) 41570 Hayes Road, Suite E-1			
16	Clinton Township, MI 48038 (586) 530-7788			
17	For the Defendant: WILLIAM R. SEIKALY (P33165)			
18	30445 Northwestern Hwy., Suite 250 Farmington Hills, MI 48334			
19	(248) 785-0102			
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

```
For the Defendant:
                              DANIEL RANDAZZO (P39935)
                              2731 S. Adams Road, Ste. 100
 2
                              Rochester Hills, MI 48309
                              (248) 853-1003
 3
 4
 5
 7
8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
                           ANGELA M. LITTLE, CSR-6444, RPR
23
         REPORTED BY:
                            Certified Court Reporter
                            (586) 469-5832
24
25
```

	1	
1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2		PAGE
3	WITNESSES: PLAINTIFF	
4	None.	
5		
6		
7	WITNESSES: DEFENDANT	
8	None.	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14	<u>EXHIBITS</u>	ADMITTED
15	None offered.	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	Mount Clemens, Michigan
2	Monday, October 31, 2016
3	At about 9:24 a.m.
4	
5	(Court, Counsel and parties present.)
6	THE CLERK: Ukrainian Credit Union versus
7	Garak.
8	MR. BIGELOW: Good morning, your Honor. For
9	the record, James Bigelow, appearing on behalf of
10	the plaintiff.
11	THE COURT: Good morning.
12	MR. SEIKALY: William Seikaly appearing on
13	behalf of the defendant Shibanov, your Honor.
14	MR. RANDAZZO: Daniel Randazzo on behalf of
15	Mr. Holyk.
16	THE COURT: Good morning.
17	MR. RANDAZZO: Good morning, Judge.
18	THE COURT: I have the Credit Union's
19	motion, correct?
20	MR. BIGELOW: Yes, your Honor.
21	THE COURT: Okay.
22	MR. BIGELOW: Your Honor, there is one
23	brief administrative issue I wanted to bring to the
24	Court's attention. Two weeks ago when we were here
25	I obtained an order to redact the Social Security

numbers from the court file and there actually was a second placement of the document containing those numbers. It was at Ms. Shibanov's motion for summary judgment. I did redact the Social Security numbers from that document as well. That's Exhibit 2 to her original motion for summary, Judge.

THE COURT: No objection?

MR. SEIKALY: Of course not, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BIGELOW: Your Honor, as you're aware at some point in this case Mr. Seikaly came into possession of a document containing 37 Social Security numbers of all the employees and board members of the plaintiff.

THE COURT: Before we go down that road again, you've got a motion to compel a deposition, clarification of an order, and disqualification?

MR. BIGELOW: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: What are we dealing with first?

MR. BIGELOW: I would like to deal with the disqualification issue first.

THE COURT: I've read everything in your motion. Is there anything that you would like to add?

MR. BIGELOW: Your Honor, as far as the

Identity Theft Protection Act in the state of
Michigan, that's MCL 445.63. Also, the Computer
Fraud and Abuse Act, 18 U.S.C. 1030. At this date,
they both come into play in this case. At this
point, your Honor, Mr. Seikaly is refusing to tell
the Court what other documents he has that were
stolen from my client. We know he had some
documents that contained personal and confidential
information of the employees and he would like to
sit Mr. Jakymowych down to do depositions to
continue in this case presumably to use those stolen
documents. He needs to come forward today and tell
the Court how he obtained those documents. He needs
to return those documents to the plaintiff.

THE COURT: And that's relative to your motion for what?

 ${\tt MR.}$ BIGELOW: For disqualification.

THE COURT: Any response, Mr. Seikaly?

MR. SEIKALY: Briefly, your Honor. I'd like the Court to know that in November of 1963 I was in Detroit, not in Dallas. Your Honor, I viewed this motion as frivolous, but I must take it seriously. I retained counsel because in 30 years of practicing law, I've never faced a motion like

this. I'm informed that when there's a potential for conflict you have an obligation to inform your client, which I've done. You have to evaluate any potential conflict. The allegation of conflict here is somehow my client and I are now both subject to criminal prosecution. Your Honor, let's make it real clear on the record I make the decisions about what exhibits get put into a motion, not my client. To the extent -- and I want to make this clear -- I didn't do anything wrong. This was an error. We all made it. We all should have caught it. None of us did. But to the extent there is anyone responsible, it's obviously me, not my client. Therefore, I don't have a conflict and I got an independent view of that.

Your Honor, I also informed my client of her ability to seek different counsel. My client was clear. I don't want to -- I don't want to waive privilege, but I have a letter the Court could see from my client on that.

Your Honor, I think I cited everything else in the brief. In terms of Mr. Bigelow's allegation that I have stolen something, or my client has stolen something, you will note that the real question is why weren't they produced and they know

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

where it came from. I'm not going to get into it.

If the Court wishes to examine me in-camera, I'll

raise my right hand and I'll tell the Court what's

going on here. But, this is simply an effort to

extort from my client. The Court's already ruled

that this case is hanging on by a sliver and they're

desperate. That's what's going on. Thank you, your

Honor.

MR. BIGELOW: May I respond, your Honor? THE COURT: Briefly.

MR. BIGELOW: Just on two issues. There's no affidavit from Mr. Seikaly's client in this case supporting anything he just said. Also, as to the fact that through discovery, Mr. Seikaly indicates that these documents should have been produced in discovery. He actually puts a quote in his brief and indicates that, Well, here's what we asked for and he references an exhibit. The exhibit is actually a letter and not any discovery request prepared or submitted to me. And certainly I would have never given Mr. Seikaly these documents. They're not relevant. They contain private confidential information. He's not coming forward today to tell anybody how he got these documents. There clearly is an underlining larceny here.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There's a larceny by conversion since he have these documents, is utilizing them in a case, and he won't say where he got them.

THE COURT: In terms of your motion to disqualify, it's respectfully denied. I am not making any finding that there was direct or actually I am making a finding that as far as I'm aware at this point, there's no direct or indirect conflict on the part of Mr. Seikaly involving what you allege to be illegally obtained documents and then a subsequent knowing and illegal production of those documents which resulted in some sort of harm. This Court is not going to do your work for you, Mr. Bigelow. If you think there was a crime committed, you have other avenues. Quit raising the I'm not going to address it again. Is that I'm not going to entertain any more motions clear? involving any of these issues in which you allege these documents were stolen. Mr. Seikaly alleges they should been produced so your motion to disqualify Mr. Seikaly is respectfully denied.

MR. SEIKALY: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Motion to compel.

MR. BIGELOW: Motion to compel the deposition of Mrs. Shibanov, your Honor. She was

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

not produced. Can I ask the Court one question regarding the documents?

THE COURT: No. We're moving on.

MR. BIGELOW: Okay. Your Honor, as to Mrs. Shibanov, I gave Mr. Seikaly a two-week window before I left for vacation quite some time ago; he did not respond at all. I scheduled the deposition as a video deposition. In light of the document theft here and these other issues, I do think she should be required to appear live so we can get into that as well as all the other issues in the case, and that's what I'm requesting in regards to Mrs. Shibanov. I believe she should be produced first. As to Mr. Jakymowych, Mr. Seikaly was given unfettered opportunity to question Mr. Jakymowych for two-and-a-half hours. He has indicated that the deposition of Mr. Jakymowych is concluded both in e-mails and in a pleading. I think his direct examination should be deemed concluded and the witness tendered to the plaintiff.

THE COURT: Mr. Seikaly?

MR. SEIKALY: Your Honor, the question becomes how many times can we cover the same issue. I did state that I was filing a motion upon the completion of what the Court had ordered for Mr.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Jakymowych's deposition. In the deposition transcript it says I still have questions. I asked him if I could move forward. Despite the fact that Mr. Jakymowych said, Yeah, let's get it done, Mr. Bigelow stopped the deposition. So that's not completed in my opinion.

Secondly, he is right. He sent me a letter, an e-mail actually, saying here is some times I want to take the deposition. I sent him an e-mail back while he was on vacation saying, Look, the judge has ruled, you don't have much of a case, let's try to resolve this case and let's schedule both depositions. I got an e-mail back that I thought was a little snarky saying, I'm on vacation. I've left you alone. Leave me alone. And, I did. Your Honor, my client didn't show up. His client didn't show up after I subpoenaed him. So, look, I'm going to, I want to make this real clear, I'm going to do whatever the Court says, and I'm not going to bring a motion for clarification, I'm not going to bring a motion to rehear, I'm not going to do any of those things. But, respectfully, your Honor, you have the patience of Job; you certainly have more than I do. And at some point, you've got to tell people who act this way that it's got to

stop. I cancelled both deps. But, whatever the Court orders, I'm going to follow. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Bigelow?

MR. BIGELOW: Your Honor, as to the subpoena, that was just another act of unethical conduct by Mr. Seikaly. He didn't subpoena me. He didn't send the notice to me. He didn't send the letter to me alone. He actually had Mr. Jakymowych served, a clear violation of the ethical rule, Michigan Rule of Professional Conduct 4.2. This conduct is just going to continue. He's in possession of stolen documents. This is what's going to continue to --

not going to be the public forum for your allegations regarding the documents, the disqualification, the unethical behavior. I have had it up to my eyeballs with that. I've had up to my eyeballs that it is contained in every single brief and in every single motion and it takes me an hour and a half to figure out what it is that you want from your continual motions, other than to just continually place in the public what you believe Mr. Seikaly is responsible or guilty of, and I'm not going to hear it anymore.

It was a blatant misrepresentation that you did not hear from Mr. Seikaly at all regarding your request for deposition dates for his client. I read those e-mails. It's also a blatant misrepresentation in one of the depositions when Mr. Seikaly indicated he had these documents and you said he's bragging about them. He just acknowledged that he had them and you were questioning about it. I don't know what you're reading that I'm reading differently that I don't see nor hear the same things that you continually reiterate in brief and in open court.

In terms of the motion to compel, first of all, we're going to finish Mr. Jakymowych's deposition. All right. Mr. Seikaly, you have another hour and one-half with him.

In terms of your the client, she's to be produced. We were going to do video depositions and that's still going to remain the same.

MR. SEIKALY: Your Honor, video conferences?

THE COURT: Video conference. She's out of state somewhere --

MR. SEIKALY: She is, your Honor.

MR. BIGELOW: And how long will I have with Mr. Jakymowych?

THE COURT: He's your client, right, or

1 your representative? Or, I mean, I don't know what 2 you want to do with him. What do you mean how long 3 do you have with him? 4 MR. BIGELOW: I mean, well, he does have 5 health concerns as you recall. You limited the 6 deposition. 7 THE COURT: Well, I did. Well, first of 8 all, your behavior which is borderline obstructive, 9 you didn't want to produce him. You filed a motion 10 for protective order, provided me his medical 11 records. I reviewed it and I said his deposition 12 could go on in increments. He was apparently fine 13 to continue, but you didn't want to do. So now you 14 want to continue so that you can cross-examine your 15 client? 16 MR. BIGELOW: Yes. 17 THE COURT: Your representative? He's okay 18 to do that? 19 MR. BIGELOW: My client's employee. 20 THE COURT: Your client's employee. 21 he's okay to participate in that; is that correct? 22 MR. BIGELOW: I mean, I think it should be 23 incrementally done, sure. 24 THE COURT: Any response, Mr. Seikaly? 25 MR. SEIKALY: Your Honor, here is my only

problem: I get an hour and a half. If he takes an
hour and a half, I have more questions. And when
the Court requires us to come back for this, Mr.
Randazzo's here, he saw, he saw Mr. Jakymowych.
This gentlemen didn't have any trouble with this
deposition. Again, I can't really challenge the
Court's ruling on this. You saw the medical
records.

THE COURT: I saw the medical records, yeah.

MR. SEIKALY: But he says he works seven hours a day.

MR. BIGELOW: That's false pride, your Honor. That's just his pride.

THE COURT: Mr. Bigelow, I'm not going to entertain anymore motions regarding the depositions or the records again. Okay. Mr. Jakymowych is going to be produced. You have another hour and 15 minutes with him Mr. Seikaly.

MR. SEIKALY: You just said an hour and a half. Which is --

THE COURT: Did I say hour and a half? I can't remember what I originally ruled.

MR. SEIKALY: Well, the original one was an hour and 15. You just said an hour and a half. I

1	just want to know which one?
2	THE COURT: Hour and 15 minutes is fine.
3	We'll stay consistent.
4	MR. BIGELOW: Thank you, your Honor.
5	THE COURT: And, Mr. Bigelow you can have
6	an hour and 15 minutes and then if Mr. Seikaly wants
7	to follow-up what you addressed in cross, he can.
8	And if Mr. Jakymowych is able to stay all day, then
9	we'll finish it in one day. When he's done, then
10	we'll do Mr. Seikaly's client by video conferencing.
11	MR. SEIKALY: Thank you, your Honor.
12	MR. BIGELOW: Thank you, your Honor.
13	MR. SEIKALY: Your Honor, we're going to run
14	into trouble with the trial date.
15	THE COURT: No, we're not. Trial is going
16	on November 29th for the one sole remaining issue.
17	MR. SEIKALY: Well, your Honor, I assume
18	that the Court will rule on that when we submit
19	these supplemental depositions before the 29th.
20	THE COURT: Yes. In fact, I would like
21	Jakymowych's and your client's deposition done this
22	week.
23	MR. BIGELOW: We'll try, your Honor.
24	THE COURT: If you can fit them in.
25	MR. SEIKALY: I'll do my best.

```
1
                    MR. BIGELOW: Thank you, your Honor.
 2
                    MR. SEIKALY: Thank you, your Honor.
 3
                    MR. RANDAZZO: Thank you, your Honor.
 4
                    THE COURT: Do a yellow order, please.
5
                    MR. BIGELOW: Of course.
 6
                    MR. SEIKALY: Thank you, your Honor.
7
          (At 9:39 a.m., proceedings concluded)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
          STATE OF MICHIGAN
2
                                       SS
3
          COUNTY OF MACOMB
 4
5
6
                   CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER
7
8
                    I, Angela M. Little, Certified Court
9
          Reporter, of the Sixteenth Judicial Circuit, in the
10
          State of Michigan, do hereby certify that the
          foregoing pages, 1 through 18, inclusive, comprise a
11
12
          full, true, and correct transcript of the
13
          proceedings had in the matter of UKRAINIAN FUTURE
          CREDIT UNION, a state chartered credit union,,
14
          Plaintiff, versus ADRII B. GARAK, et al, Defendant,
15
          Case No. 2015-0524-CZ, on Monday, 31st of
16
17
          October, 2016.
18
19
                             /s/ Angela M. Little
                             ANGELA M. LITTLE - CSR-6444, RPR
20
21
          DATED: 11/1/16
22
23
24
25
```

1 STATE OF MICHIGAN 2) SS 3 COUNTY OF MACOMB 4 5 6 CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER 8 I, Angela M. Little, Certified Court 9 Reporter, of the Sixteenth Judicial Circuit, in the State of Michigan, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, 1 through 18, inclusive, comprise a full, true, and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the matter of UKRAINIAN FUTURE CREDIT UNION, a state chartered credit union,, Plaintiff, versus ADRII B. GARAK, et al, Defendant, Case No. 2015-0524-CZ, on Monday, 31st of October, 2016. /s/ Angela M. Little ANGELA M. LITTLE - CSR-6444, RPR DATED: 11/1/16